



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

17555 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 779-7247 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov / Email: General@ch.morgan-hill.ca.gov

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

OCTOBER 7, 2004

PRESENT: Cain, Fruit, Martin, Pyle

ABSENT: Kennett

LATE: None

STAFF: Senior Planner Linder

REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Fruit called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Senior Planner Linder certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Fruit opened/closed the public comment period. No public comments were received.

MINUTES:

SEPTEMBER 16, 2004 **BOARD MEMBERS CAIN/PYLE MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 16, 2004 MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 4-0 AS FOLLOWS:**

AYES: CAIN, FRUIT, MARTIN, PYLE

NOES: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

ABSENT: KENNETT

NEW BUSINESS

BOARD MEMBER MARTIN STEPPED DOWN FOR THIS ITEM.

1. **SITE REVIEW, SR-04-16: COCHRANE-ASSISTED LIVING CENTER/PUD REVIEW:** A request for site, architectural and landscape plan approval for a 70,629 sq. ft. (94 units) assisted living facility to be located on a 2.4 acre parcel within the DePaul PUD located on the south side of Cochrane Rd. between Mission View Dr. and St. Louise Dr.

BOARD MEMBERS FRUIT/PYLE MOTIONED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION NO. 04-029 WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

STANDARD CONDITION XIII B: Include the word “median” as a street improvement and insert “Cochrane Rd.” in the blank.

STANDARD CONDITION XVI C: Insert the word “site” in the blank.

ADD OTHER CONDITION NO. 1: Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall return with detailed landscape plans for review and approval by a subcommittee of the Board.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF 3-0 AS FOLLOWS:

**AYES: CAIN, FRUIT, PYLE
NOES: NONE
ABSTAIN: NONE
ABSENT: KENNETT, MARTIN**

BOARD MEMBER MARTIN RETURNED TO HIS SEAT

2. **2004 CITY COUNCIL GOAL REGARDING GOVERNANCE:** CITY MANAGER, ED TEWES ASKED THE BOARD TO RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. What was your experience with the appointment or reappointment process?

The Board members agreed that the appointment/reappointment process was fine, but were concerned with the length of their terms. The majority (4 out of 5) of the Board are now on their 3rd term. Board members concurred that turnover is healthy.

a. What should the length of a term be?

The Board agreed that 2 years is appropriate.

2. What type of orientation did you receive?

Board member responded that they had received a staff orientation which they felt was sufficient.

b. What type of on-going training is provided?

The Board indicated that workshops/seminars are not available for the type of work that they do. Most of the training is done on-the-job, as the Board deals with various projects and issues.

3. Is the Board clear about its purpose and mission?

All Board members indicated that they felt they had a well defined mission and purpose.

4. How does the Board feel about the staff support, record keeping and analysis?

Board members felt staff support is fine. Staff reports and record keeping have been adequate.

5. How has the workload been?

The Board indicates that the workload follows the construction cycles. Sometimes there are 7-8 item agendas which result in 4 hour meetings, other times there may be only 2 items on the agenda.

a. The Board meets twice a month; do you need to meet more often?

The Board concurred that twice a month seemed adequate. It was preferable to have two longer meetings than three-four shorter meetings.

6. How is your agenda established? Who decides what subjects will be worked on?

The agendas are primarily application-driven. Smaller issues are self-driven and are sorted out through discussion that occurs when applications are considered. Larger issues are usually driven by the Planning Commission and City Council.

7. How is your relationship with other committees or commissions that may share "jurisdiction" on policy matter?

The Board members indicated that some jurisdictional issues occur with the Planning Commission as a result of the Commission's approval of a site plan layouts. Approval of PUD's by the Planning Commission and Council prior to Board review has been problematic, but has improved with PUD review by the Board prior to Commission and

Council approval.

8. Does the Board receive public input?

The Board indicated that rarely non-applicants attend meetings.

a. Is the level of public input sufficient? Should there be more?

The Board indicated that it was fine as is.

9. How does the Board communicate with the City Council?

Board members indicated that most communications have been through recommendations on applications, minutes or staff. The Board indicated that most communication has been through minutes, which has been fine, but would like to have additional workshops with the Council

ADJOURNMENT: Chairman Fruit adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

TERRY LINDER
Meeting Coordinator